

REMARKS

The Examiner has cited a new reference. Claims 46-55 and 57-61 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as unpatentable over Kageyama in view of Barnard in view of the newly cited Yamamoto.

Claim 46 as amended clearly distinguishes at least by reciting in a method for simplifying maintenance, adjustment, and error analysis of a data object, said data object not being controllable from the control panel of the printer, in the printer or copier at least a first control unit and a second control unit are provided and wherein the data object is stored in the storage region of the second control unit, the data object comprising a parameter for control of the printer or copier, and wherein a first identifier as a first network address is associated with the first control unit, a second identifier is associated as a second network address with a second control unit, and a third identifier is a third network address which is different than the second identifier second network address is associated with the data object to enable a simplified direct access to the data object by the external control unit for the maintenance, adjustment, and error analysis of the data object and wherein the network addresses are hierarchically organized, the third network address of the object being hierarchically subordinate to the second network address, and the second control unit having a router using the third identifier to route maintenance, adjustment, and error information to or from the object. Note that the language added at the end of claim 46 is taken substantially from now cancelled dependent claim 47. Kageyama was only cited for managing a printer with an external computer to cope with trouble in the printer and for the presence of a printer engine 2200 and a printer controller 2100 being read as the first and second control units.

But none of the other recited features discussed above in claim 46 are present in Kageyama.

The Examiner also cites a second reference Barnard for a network management device shown in Fig. 1 which can send information to and from a plurality of separate printers and servers spread out on a network 10 by using addresses. But Barnard does not satisfy any of the above recited novel claim language in claim 46.

The Examiner also relies on a third reference Yamamoto. First the Examiner cites column 8, lines 9-60 for Applicant's claim language of objects not being controllable from the control panel of the printer or copier. But column 8, lines 9-60 of Yamamoto nowhere teach this. Here Yamamoto refers to software structure of objects (Fig. 4) and a structure of a network packet by encoding such objects (Fig. 5). Also note that column 7, lines 58-61 define an object as software structure comprising a set of data and processing associated with a concept within a problem area. However there is no disclosure here that the data objects to which the maintenance, adjustment, and error analysis information is sent to or from is not controllable from the control panel. Thus this feature is clearly not disclosed in Yamamoto.

Next, the Examiner cites column 8, lines 59-60 in Yamamoto for the claim 46 limitation of associating a third identifier with the data object where a second identifier is a second control unit where the data object is stored. More specifically the Examiner relies on column 9, lines 10-45 together with column 8, lines 9-60. But column 9, lines 10-45 just talk about identification information for specifying a target object at line 33 but there is no disclosure or even a hint that the object is in a

second control unit where that second control unit has a second identifier and the object stored therein has a third identifier. Also note Applicants' new claim language that the network addresses are hierarchically organized, the third network address of the object being hierarchically subordinate to the second network address, and the second control unit having a router using the third identifier to route maintenance, adjustment, and error information to or from the object stored in a storage region of that same second control unit. Nothing like this is even remotely disclosed in column 9, lines 10-45.

The Examiner also cites column 8, lines 9-60 in Yamamoto. This deals with moving an object from one network node to another and to transfer a network packet to an interpreter specified by the argument in a "go" operation (see lines 58-60). However there is no disclosure here of associating a third network address identifier with a data object. Although Yamamoto at column 9, lines 22-37 discloses how objects are referenced, he uses a pointer or an identifier to the class to which the object belongs (see line 26 and line 36 of column 9). But this is clearly not assigning a third network address as recited in claim 46.

Note particularly that claim 46 utilizes a second control unit having a second address, and then using a third address, this second control unit addresses a data object stored in this same internal control unit and wherein the second address has a higher hierarchy than the third address. Nothing like this is shown in Yamamoto.

It is further noted that apparently the Examiner relies on the Kageyama reference for the two control units, citing the printer engine 2200 and the printer controller 2100. But in Kageyama the external computer communicates with the printer controller 2120 which the Examiner apparently is analogizing to be the first

control unit in Applicant's claim 46. Following this analogy, the Examiner must be relying upon the printer engine 2200 as being the second control unit. But this second control unit does not have any object stored in a storage region thereof which is being maintained, adjusted, and an error analysis performed. Thus it is not possible that a combination of Kageyama with Yamamoto and Barnard could suggest Applicants' claim 46.

Also different from Yamamoto is the recitation in claim 46 that the data object comprises a parameter for control of the printer or copier and it is this data object with respect to which the maintenance, adjustment, and error analysis is being performed. But in Yamamoto the objects are software structures and not parameters which control the printer or copier, but wherein said data object is not controllable from the control panel of the printer.

Dependent claims 48-58 and 60 distinguish at least for the reasons noted with respect to claim 46 and also by reciting additional features not suggested.

System claim 61 distinguishes for the reasons noted with respect to claim 46.

Allowance of the application is respectfully requested.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required, or to credit any overpayment to account No. 501519.

Submitted by,

 (Reg. 27,841)

BRETT A. VALIQUET
SCHIFF HARDIN LLP
CUSTOMER NO. 26574
Patent Department
233 South Wacker Drive
Suite 6600
Chicago, Illinois 60606
Telephone: 312/258-5790
Attorneys for Applicant(s).